

A NOTE ON POWER VALUES OF DERIVATION IN PRIME AND SEMIPRIME RINGS

SHERVIN SAHEBI¹, VENUS RAHMANI^{2,*}

ABSTRACT. let R be a ring with derivation d , such that $(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n$ for all $x, y \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. In this paper, we show that if R is a prime, then $d = 0$ or R is a commutative. If R is a semiprime, then d maps R in to its center. Moreover in semiprime case let $A = O(R)$ be the orthogonal completion of R and $B = B(C)$ be the Boolean ring of C , where C is the extended centroid of R , then there exists an idempotent $e \in B$ such that eA is commutative ring and d induce a zero derivation on $(1 - e)A$.

MSC: 16R50; 16N60; 16D60

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be an associative ring with center $Z(R)$. Recall that an additive map $d : R \rightarrow R$ is called derivation if $d(xy) = d(x)y + xd(y)$, for all $x, y \in R$. Many results in literature indicate that global structure of a prime (semiprime) ring R is often lightly connected to the behaviour of additive mappings defined on R . A well-known result of Herstein [13] stated that if R is a prime ring and d is an inner derivation of R such that $d(x)^n = 0$ for all $x \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ fixed integer, then $d = 0$. The number of authors extended this theorem in several ways. In [12] Giambruno and Herstein extended this result to arbitrary derivations in semiprime rings. In [5] Carini and Giambruno proved that if R is a prime ring with derivation d such that $d(x)^{n(x)} = 0$ for all $x \in L$, a Lie ideal of R , then $d(L) = 0$ when R has no non-zero nil right ideal and $\text{char } R \neq 2$. The same conclusion holds when $n(x) = n$ is fixed and R is a 2-torsion free semiprime ring. Using the ideas in [5] and the methods in [10] Lanski [16] removed both the bound on the indices of nilpotence and the characteristic assumptions on R . In [4] Bresar gave a generalization of the result due to Herstein and Giambruno [12]

Key words and phrases. Derivation, prime ring, semiprime ring, Martindale quotient ring.

* Corresponding author. Email: ven.rahmani.math@iauctb.ac.ir.

in another direction. Explicitly, he proved in semiprime ring R with derivation d and $a \in R$, if $ad(x)^n = 0$ for all $x \in R$, where $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer, then $ad(R) = 0$ when R is an $(n-1)!$ -torsion free ring. In recent years, a number of articles discussed derivations in the context of prime and semiprime rings (see [6, 11, 20, 8, 1, 9]).

But here we will extend Herstein result's [13] when the condition is more widespread.

Indeed, we consider the situation when $(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n$ for all $x, y \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer.

The main results in this paper are as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let R be a prime ring and d a derivation of R . Suppose $(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n$ for all $x, y \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. Then $d = 0$ or R is commutative.*

When R is a semiprime ring, we prove:

Theorem 1.2. *Let R be a semiprime ring and d a non-zero derivation of R . Suppose $(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n$ for all $x, y \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. Then d maps R into its center.*

Theorem 1.3. *Let R be a semiprime ring with derivation d . Consider $(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n$ for all $x, y \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. Further, let $A = O(R)$ be the orthogonal completion of R and $B = B(C)$ where C the extended centroid of R . Then there exists idempotent $e \in B$ such that eA is a commutative ring and d induce a zero derivation on $(1 - e)A$.*

Throughout the paper we use the standard notation from [3].

In particular, we denote by Q the two sided Martindale quotient of prime (semiprime) ring R and C the center of Q . We call C the extended centroid of R .

2. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Firstly we consider the case when R is a prime ring. The following results are useful tools needed in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.1. (see [7, Theorem 2]). *Let R be a prime ring and I a non-zero ideal of R . Then I , R and Q satisfy the same generalized polynomial identities with coefficient in Q .*

Lemma 2.2. (see [18, Theorem 2]). *Let R be a prime ring and I a non-zero ideal of R . Then I , R and Q satisfy the same differential identities.*

Theorem 2.3. (Kharchenko [15]). *Let R be a prime ring, d a nonzero derivation of R and I a nonzero ideal of R . If I satisfies the differential identity*

$$f(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n, d(r_1), d(r_2), \dots, d(r_n)) = 0,$$

for any $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n \in I$, then one of the following holds:

(i) *I satisfies the generalized polynomial identity*

$$f(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 0.$$

(ii) *d is Q -inner, that is, for some $q \in Q$, $d(x) = [q, x]$ and I satisfies the generalized polynomial identity*

$$f(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n, [q, r_1], [q, r_2], \dots, [q, r_n]) = 0.$$

We establish the following technical result required in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.4. *Let R be a prime ring with extended centroid C . Suppose $([a, x]y + x[a, y])^n - [a, x]^n[a, y]^n = 0$, for all $x, y \in R$ and some $a \in R$. Then R is commutative or $a \in C$.*

Proof. If R is commutative there is nothing to prove. Suppose R is not commutative. Set

$$f(x, y) = ([a, x]y + x[a, y])^n - [a, x]^n[a, y]^n.$$

Since R is not commutative. Then by Lemma 2.1, $f(x, y)$ is a nontrivial generalized polynomial identity for R and so for Q .

In case C is infinite, we have $f(x, y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in Q \otimes_C \overline{C}$, where $\overline{C}$ is the algebraic closure of C . Since both Q and $Q \otimes_C \overline{C}$ are prime and centrally closed [14], we may replace R by Q or $Q \otimes_C \overline{C}$ according to C finite or infinite. Thus we may assume that R is a centrally closed over C which is either finite or algebraically closed and $f(x, y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$. By Martindale's Theorem [19], R is then a primitive ring having nonzero socle H with C as associated division ring. Hence by Jacobson's Theorem [14] R is isomorphic to a dense ring of linear transformations of some vector space V over C , and H consists of the linear transformations in R of finite rank. Let $\dim_C V = k$. Then the density of R on V implies that $R \cong M_k(C)$. If $\dim_C V = 1$, then R is a commutative, which is a contradiction.

Suppose that $\dim_C V \geq 2$. We show that for any $v \in V$, v and av are linearly dependent over C . Suppose v and av are linearly independent for some $v \in V$. By density of R , there exist $x, y \in R$ such that

$$xv = 0, \quad xav = v,$$

$$yv = 0, \quad yav = v.$$

Since $[a, y]^n v = [a, x]^n v = (-1)^n v$. Hence we get following contradiction

$$0 = ([a, x]y + x[a, y])^n - [a, x]^n [a, y]^n v = -v.$$

So we conclude that $\{v, av\}$ are linearly C -dependent. Hence for each $v \in V$, $av = v\alpha_v$ for some $\alpha_v \in C$. Now we prove α_v is not depending on the choice of $v \in V$.

Since $\dim_C V \geq 2$ there exists $w \in V$ such that v and w are linearly independent over C . Now there exist $\alpha_v, \alpha_w, \alpha_{v+w} \in C$ such that

$$av = v\alpha_v, aw = w\alpha_w, a(v+w) = (v+w)\alpha_{(v+w)}.$$

Which implies

$$v(\alpha_v - \alpha_{(v+w)}) + w(\alpha_w - \alpha_{(v+w)}) = 0,$$

and since $\{v, w\}$ are linearly C -independent, it follows $\alpha_v = \alpha_{(v+w)} = \alpha_w$. Therefore there exists $\alpha \in C$ such that $av = v\alpha$ for all $v \in V$.

Now let $r \in R$, $v \in V$. Since $av = v\alpha$,

$$[a, r]v = (ar)v - (ra)v = a(rv) - r(av) = (rv)\alpha - r(v\alpha) = 0,$$

that is $[a, r]V = 0$. Hence $[a, r] = 0$ for all $r \in R$, implying $a \in C$. $\square$

Now we can prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let R be not commutative. By the given hypothesis, R satisfies the generalized differential identity

$$(1) \quad (d(x)y + xd(y))^n = (d(x))^n (d(y))^n.$$

By Lemma 2.2, R and Q satisfy the same differential identities, thus Q satisfies (1). We divide the proof in two cases:

Case 1. d is a Q -inner derivation. In the case, there exists an element $a \in Q$ such that $d(x) = [a, x]$ and $d(y) = [a, y]$ for all $x, y \in Q$. Notice that Q satisfies the generalized polynomial identity $([a, x]y + x[a, y])^n = [a, x]^n [a, y]^n$. In this case the conclusion follows from Lemma 1. Thus we have $a \in C$ and so $d = 0$.

Case 2. d is not a Q -inner derivation. Applying Theorem 2.2, then (1) becomes

$$(zy + xw)^n - (z)^n (w)^n,$$

for all $x, y, z, w \in Q$. If $z = w$, then Q satisfies

$$(zy + xz)^n - z^{2n} = 0.$$

This is a polynomial identity. Hence there exists a field F such that $Q \subseteq M_k(F)$, the ring of $k \times k$ matrices over field F , where $k > 1$. Moreover

Q and $M_k(F)$ satisfy the same polynomial identity [17, Lemma 1]. Choose

$$x = z = e_{ij}, \quad y = e_{ji},$$

for all $i \neq j$. This leads to the contradiction

$$0 = (zy + xz)^n - z^{2n} = e_{ii}.$$

This complete the proof. $\square$

The following example shows the hypothesis of primeness is essential in Theorem 1.1.

Example 2.5. Let S be any ring, and $R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & b \\ 0 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c \in S \right\}$.

Define $d : R \rightarrow R$ as follows:

$$d \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & b \\ 0 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & b \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $0 \neq d$ is a derivation of R such that $(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n$ for all $x, y \in R$, where $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer, however R is not commutative.

Now let R be a semiprime ring.

We establish the following technical result required in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 2.6. (see [2, Lemma 1 and Theorem 1] or [18, pages 31-32]). *Let R be a semiprime ring and P a maximal ideal of C . Then PQ is a prime ideal of Q invariant under all derivations of Q . Moreover*

$$\cap \{P \mid PQ \text{ is maximal ideal of } C\} = 0.$$

Now we can prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Since any derivation d can be uniquely extended to a derivation in Q , and R, Q satisfy the same differential identities [18, Theorem 3], we have

$$(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n,$$

for all $x, y \in Q$. Let P be any maximal ideal of C by Lemma 2.6, PQ is prime ideal of Q invariant under d . Set $\overline{Q} = Q/PQ$. Then derivation d canonically induces a derivation $\bar{d}$ on $\overline{Q}$ defined by $\bar{d}(\bar{x}) = \overline{d(x)}$ for all $x \in Q$. Therefore,

$$(\bar{d}(\overline{xy}))^n = (\bar{d}(\bar{x}))^n(\bar{d}(\bar{y}))^n,$$

for all $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \overline{Q}$. By Theorem 1.1 $d(Q) \subseteq PQ$ or $[Q, Q] \subseteq PQ$. Hence $d(Q)[Q, Q] \subseteq PQ$ for any maximal ideal P of C . By Lemma 2.6, $d(Q)[Q, Q] = 0$. Without loss of generality we have $d(R)[R, R] = 0$. This implies that

$$d(R^2)[R, R] = d(R)R[R, R].$$

Therefore

$$[R, d(R)]R[R, d(R)] = 0.$$

By semiprimeness of R , we have $[R, d(R)] = 0$. This complete the proof. $\square$

Now let R be a semiprime orthogonally complete ring with extended centroid C . The notations $B = B(C)$ and $\text{spec}(B)$ denotes Boolean ring of C and the set of all maximal ideal of B , respectively. It is well known that if $M \in \text{spec}(B)$ then $R_M = R/RM$ is prime [3, Theorem 3.2.7]. We use the notations Ω - Δ -ring, Horn formulas and Hereditary formulas. We refer the reader to [3, pages 37, 38, 43, 120] for the definitions and the related properties of these objects.

We establish the following technical result required in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 2.7. [3, Theorem 3.2.18]. *Let R be an orthogonally complete Ω - Δ -ring with extended centroid C , $\Psi_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ Horn formulas of signature Ω - Δ , $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and $\Phi(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)$ a Hereditary first order formula such that $\neg\Phi$ is a Horn formula. Further, let $\vec{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in R^{(n)}$, $\vec{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m) \in R^{(m)}$. Suppose $R \models \Phi(\vec{c})$ and for every $M \in \text{spec}(B)$ there exists a natural number $i = i(M) > 0$ such that*

$$R_M \models \Phi(\phi_M(\vec{c})) \implies \Psi_i(\phi_M(\vec{a})),$$

where $\phi_M : R \rightarrow R_M = R/RM$ is the canonical projection. Then there exists a natural number $k > 0$ and pairwise orthogonal idempotents $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k \in B$ such that $e_1 + e_2 + \dots + e_k = 1$ and $e_i R \models \Psi_i(e_i \vec{a})$ for all $e_i \neq 0$.

We denote $O(R)$ the orthogonal completion of R which is defined as the intersection of all orthogonally complete subset of Q containing R . Now we can prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By assumption we have R satisfies

$$(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n.$$

According to [3, Theorem 3.1.16] $d(A) \subseteq A$ and $d(e) = 0$ for all $e \in B$. Therefore, A is an orthogonally complete Ω - Δ -ring, where $\Omega = \{o, +, -, \cdot, d\}$. Consider formulas

$$\Phi = (\forall x)(\forall y)\|(d(xy))^n = (d(x))^n(d(y))^n\|,$$

$$\Psi_1 = (\forall x)\|d(x) = 0\|,$$

$$\Psi_2 = (\forall x)(\forall y)\|xy = yx\|.$$

One can easily check that Φ is a hereditary first order formula and $\neg\Phi$, Ψ_1 , Ψ_2 are Horn formulas. So using Theorem 1.1 shows that all conditions of lemma 2.7 are fulfilled. Hence there exist two orthogonal idempotent e_1 and e_2 such that $e_1 + e_2 = 1$ and if $e_i \neq 0$, then $e_i A \models \Psi_i$, $i = 1, 2$. The proof is complete. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Argac, N., Filippis, V. (2010). *Co-centralizing derivations and nilpotent values on Lie ideals*. Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. 41(3):475-483.
- [2] Beidar, K. I. (1978). *Rings of quotients of semiprime rings*. Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. 33(5):36-43.
- [3] Beidar, K. I., Martindale III, W. S., Mikhalev, A. V. (1996). *Rings with generalized identities*. Pure and Applied Math. Vol. 196. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- [4] Bresar, M. (1990). *A note on derivations*. Math. J. Okayama Univ. 32:83-88.
- [5] Carini, L., Giambruno, A. (1985). *Lie ideals and nil derivations*. Boll. Un. Math. Ital. 6:497-503.
- [6] Carini, L., Filippis, V. (2000). *Commutators with power central values on a Lie ideal*. Pacific J. Math. 193(2):269-278.
- [7] Chuang, C. L. (1988). *GPI's having coefficients in Utumi quotient rings*. Proc. Amer. Math. soc. 103:723-728.
- [8] Dhara, B. (2009). *Power values of derivations with annihilator conditions on Lie ideals in prime rings*. Comm. Algebra. 37(6): 2159-2167.
- [9] Dhara, B. (2011). *Annihilator condition on power values of derivations*. Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. 42(5):357-369.

- [10] Felzenszwalb, B., Lanski, C. (1983). *On the centralizers of ideals and nil derivations*. J. Algebra. 83:520-530.
- [11] Filippis, V. (2001) *Lie ideals and annihilator conditions on power values of commutators with derivation*. Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. 32:649-656.
- [12] Giambruno, A., Herstein, I. N. (1981). *Derivations with nilpotent values*. Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo. 30(2):199-206.
- [13] Herstein, I. N. (1979). *Center like elements in prime rings*. J. Alebra. 60:567-574.
- [14] Jacobson, N. (1964). *Structure of rings*. Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Pub. 37. Providence, RI: Amer. Math. Soc.
- [15] Kharchenko, V. K. (1978). *Differential identity of prime rings*. Algebra and Logic. 17:155-168.
- [16] Lanski, C. (1990). *Derivation with nilpotent values on Lie ideals*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 108:31-37.
- [17] Lanski, C. (1993). *An engle condition with derivation*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 183(3):731-734.
- [18] Lee, T. K. (1992). *Semiprime rings with differential identities*. Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica. 20(1):27-38.
- [19] Martindale III, W.S. (1969). *Prime rings satistying a generalized polynomial identity*. J.Algebra. 12:576-584.
- [20] Sharma, R. K., Dhara, B. (2005). *An annihilator condition on prime rings with derivations*. Tamsui Oxf. J. Math. Sci. 21(1):71-80.

^{1,2} DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY, CENTRAL TEHRAN BRANCH, 13185/768, TEHRAN, IRAN.